

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 remain pending in the present application. The claims have not been amended in response to this Office Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Pat. No. 5,055,027) in view of Meyer (U.S. Pat. No. 4,136,969). Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Pat. No. 5,055,027) in view of Meyer (U.S. Pat. No. 4,136,969) as applied to Claims 1, 3-7 and 9, 11-14 above, and further in view of Murata, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,980,227). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections by the Examiner. The Examiner agrees that Sato does not disclose a screw which includes a pressure portion, an extended portion and a kneading portion. The Examiner then looks to Meyer for this disclosure. In his response, the Examiner states "The pressure portion 25 has the feed rate per revolution progressively decreased toward the front end extrusion port while the extended portion 26 has the feed rate per revolution increased toward the forward end extrusion port." Applicant does not believe this feature is disclosed in Meyer and Applicant asks the Examiner to point out where in Meyer this feature is described.

Column 5 defines a single-start helical thread 27 (lines 6, 7). There is nothing in Meyer which states that the feed rate per revolution of helical thread 27 progressively decreases toward the forward end. In a similar manner, column 5 defines a two-start

helical thread 28 (line 8, 9). There is nothing in Meyer which states that the feed rate per revolution of helical thread 28 progressively increases toward the forward end.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the October 15, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner states that the progressively decreasing and increasing feature of the claim is an intended result and that there is no teaching in the specification or support in the claim for the feed rates being dependent on structural limitations. The Examiner then states "Feed rate is dependent on the material fed and the use of the apparatus, such as rotation speed of the screw." Applicant disagrees with the Examiner. The feed rate may be dependent on the rotation speed of the screw but the speed rate per revolution is not. The speed rate per revolution is built into the screw by designing the leads to be progressively further apart or closer together. (Page 13, lines 16-19 and lines 33-36 of the specification). Thus, the structural limitation is taught in the specification and the claim is not reciting intended use. No matter what the speed of rotation, the feed rate per revolution remains constant.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3-8 and 11-15, which ultimately depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg